

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 3-22 and 24-35 are allowed.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,978,011 to Jacob et al. ("Jacob").

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,168 to Decker et al. ("Decker").

The Examiner has requested that the application serial number be corrected on the PTO Form 1449 accompanying the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 3, 2001.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for allowing claims 3-22 and 24-35.

Claims 1-2 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 3-35 are pending.

The PTO Form 1449

The Examiner has requested that the application serial number be corrected on the PTO Form 1449 accompanying the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 3, 2001.

Applicants thank the Examiner for bringing this inadvertant oversight to Applicants' attention.

Applicants submit concurrently herewith a copy of the PTO Form 1449 with the correct application serial number. However, Applicants respectfully submit that there should be no confusion as to which application the PTO Form 1449 corresponds because the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 3, 2001 that accompanied the PTO Form 1449 includes the correct application serial number.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacob.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-2 without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejections of claims 1-2 moot.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Decker.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claim 23 recites a color processing method including repeating a prediction of amounts of three colors except black, under the condition that one of the three colors is equalized to 0% successively, until both two colors out of the three predicted from representative color signals of the input color signal have a non-negative value, clipping a predicted K between 0% and 100% when the predicted two colors have a non-negative value, and calculating an achromatic K.

Applicants respectfully submit that the description at col. 2, ll. 27-37 of Decker is merely a theoretical example of a process called black substitution wherein a color including respective percentages of cyan, magenta and yellow can be approximated by removing, for example, the

cyan component, removing the same percentage of each of the remaining magenta and yellow components, and substituting black in the same percentage.

Applicants submit that Decker does not teach or suggest at least a color processing method including repeating a prediction of amounts of three colors except black, under the condition that one of the three colors is equalized to 0% successively, until both two colors out of the three predicted from representative color signals of the input color signal have a non-negative value, clipping a predicted K between 0% and 100% when the predicted two colors have a non-negative value, and calculating an achromatic K, as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), of claim 23, be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that claims 3-35 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: February 16, 2005

By: 

Peter J. Sistrare

Registration No. 48,183

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202.739.3000